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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for responding to my review. I judge you have responded appropriately in most instances, and now make a few additional comments to improve the manuscript further.

Major compulsory revisions:
1. Could you elaborate more on your conceptual framework (Goffman's frame analysis) and bring it back in when discussing data. This will enable you to make theoretical generalisations that might be applicable to other translational initiatives.
2. The conclusion is weak. Please elaborate upon practical and policy implications, and make clear how you contribute to literature. Finally, suggest future research.

Minor essential revisions:
1. Tell the reader more about your embedded observations and analysis of this observational data.
2. Page 2, 'other studies are tackling this' - provide citations. Also note other studies (external evaluations funded under NIHR SDO programme at least) are also examining process of translation, and not evaluating outcome (although CLAHRC internal evaluations might be doing this).
3. Page 15, you state that CLAHRCs may be a manifestation of the KT gap without explaining what is a 'big' statement. Also don't understand why this is 'ironic'.
4. I am still not comfortable with your mentions of image and identity, given this is not elaborated theoretically or empirically. Maybe just use more intuitive labelling of mission/role?
5. In describing your data analysis, you mention a 'table' of codes. Could you include this in manuscript as a way of seeing how you derived your storyline, and to give us a sense of the wider data set.

Discretionary revisions:
I note the first author is a doctoral student. Well done for the manuscript thus far. Regarding response letter, you might elaborate upon your response more,
ensuring you keep reviewers onside. Just a tip!
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